



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/000,209	11/02/2001	Hiroshi Hoshino	6737-01	9139
7590	04/01/2004		EXAMINER	
McCormick, Paulding & Huber City Place II 185 Asylum Street Hartford, CT 06103-3402			BECKER, DREW E	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1761	

DATE MAILED: 04/01/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/000,209	HOSHINO, HIROSHI
Examiner	Art Unit	
Drew E Becker	1761	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 March 2004.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 4 and 5 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-3 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election of claims 1-3 in the response of March 1, 2004 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).
2. Claims 4-5 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected group, there being no allowable generic or linking claim.

Specification

3. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it exceeds 150 words in length and because it consists of two separate paragraphs. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
5. Claim 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

6. Claims 1-2 recite "such as". It is not clear whether the examples following "such as" are required by the claim, or not.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 2-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prohaska [Pat. No. 2,953,461] in view of Neumann [Pat. No. 3,116,680].
Prohaska teaches a method of making sausage by preheating previously ground meat by joule heating (Figure 1, #22), inherently enhancing viscosity, forming the ground meat into shape (Figure 1, #20), a main heating step (column 3, line 21), and preheating at about 140°F (column 3, line 49). Prohaska does not recite joule heating in the main heating step and a temperature of at least 75°C. Neumann teaches a method of making sausage by fully cooking the sausage at 175°F via joule heating (column 4, lines 3-33; column 5, line 21). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the joule final heating of Neumann into the invention of Prohaska since both are directed to sausage making methods, since Prohaska already included a final cooking step (column 3, line 21), and since Neumann teaches that sausage were commonly cooked via joule heating (column 4, lines 3-33).

9. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prohaska, in view of Neumann, as applied above, and further in view of JP 361058533A and JP 408214785A.

Prohaska and Neumann teach the above mentioned concepts. Prohaska and Neumann do not recite removing fat by soaking in water, or adding salt and seasonings. JP 361058533A teaches a method of making meat products by removing fat by soaking it in water (abstract). JP 408214785A teaches a method of making sausage by adding salt and seasonings (abstract). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the fat removal of JP 361058533A into the invention of Prohaska, in view of Neumann, since all are directed to methods of making meat products, since sausage was often made from mutton, and since consumers preferred low-fat foods. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the salt and seasonings of JP 408214785A into the invention of Prohaska, in view of Neumann, since all are directed to methods of making meat products, since Neumann already included seasonings (column 4, line 6), and since salt and seasonings were commonly used in sausage as shown by JP 408214785A.

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. JP 11346725A, Bushnell et al [Pat. No. 5,514,391], Bilynsky [Pat. No. 3,590,725], Prohaska [Pat. No. 2,685,518], Hoshino [pat. No. 5,653,160], and JP 2002045110A teach methods for joule heating of meat.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Drew E Becker whose telephone number is 571-272-1396. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Thur. 8am-5pm and every other Fri. 8am-4pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Milton Cano can be reached on 571-272-1398. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Drew E Becker
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1761

3-29-04